

## TWO TEXTS OF PATAÑJALI AND A STATISTICAL COMPARISON OF THEIR VOCABULARIES

(Justification of the Statistical Method and its Limitations)

*Adolf Janáček, Praha*

Patañjali is said to be the author of two sanskrit texts viz. of Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya (a grammar commentary)<sup>1</sup> and of Yoga-sūtras.<sup>2</sup> The identity of both authors however was denied, mainly by H. Jacobi, who in his treatise "*Über das Alter des Yogaśāstra*"<sup>3</sup> sums up his objections against identity in a controversy against the criticism of his former arguments<sup>4</sup> carried on by Jwala Prasad.<sup>5</sup> The supporters of the identity of the author of both the works can according to Jacobi rely only on the identity of names and on an extended but doubtful Indian tradition. Competent Indian writers such as *Bhartrhari*, *Kaiyata*, *Vāmana*, *Jayāditya*, *Nāgeśa* and others do not express their views on this question.<sup>6</sup> According to Jacobi their silence only testifies that the identity of both Patañjalis seemed to them to be quite improbable and doubtful.

H. Jacobi refers to J. H. Woods's evidence<sup>7</sup> that there is a philosophical disagreement in both authors. On the other hand however S. Dasgupta<sup>8</sup> does not find anything in Mahābhāṣya that could oppose the hypothesis on the identity of both Patañjalis. J. W. Hauer<sup>9</sup> then is of the opinion that Patañjali, the grammarian, wrote only a part of the text viz. *yogāṅga* text from II 28—III 55, which became a prototype or model for further texts collected and edited by the latest editor. In this way he wanted to remove Jacobi's objections against the 1<sup>st</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> book of the Yoga-sūtras, showing a marked buddhist influence.

H. Jacobi then says towards the end of his treatise that following the present line we can hardly reach agreement and he suggests another way by which, as he hopes, a final decision can be reached, independent on subjective view points.

In this way, however, Jacobi definitely weakens his former arguments

<sup>1</sup> Published by F. Kielhorn, Vol. I, Part I—III. Vol. II, Part I—III. Vol. III, Part I—III. Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona No. XVIII—XXII, XXVI, XXVIII—XXX.

<sup>2</sup> The Yogasūtras of Patañjali. Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrit Series No. XLVI, 1917.

<sup>3</sup> Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik. Band 8. Leipzig 1931, pp. 80—88.

<sup>4</sup> JAOS 1911 and „Über das ursprüngliche Yogasystem“ in Sitzungsberichte der Preuß. Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse 1929, 1930, Berlin.

<sup>5</sup> "The Date of the Yoga-Sūtras". IRAS 1930, p. 365 ff.

<sup>6</sup> S. Dasgupta: A History of Indian Philosophy. I, p. 231. Cambridge 1932.

<sup>7</sup> Yoga-System of Patañjali. Harvard Oriental Series Vol. 17. Introduction p. XV and so on.

<sup>8</sup> a. a. O., p. 231 ff.

<sup>9</sup> Der Yoga als Heilweg. Stuttgart 1932, pp. 98 ff.

against the identity of both authors which after all can be seen in another argument<sup>10</sup> used elsewhere expressing a view that Patañjali the grammarian could not use an incorrect expression "*vr̥ttayaḥ pañcatayyaḥ*" instead of "*vr̥ttih pañcatayī*", to put it differently, that he wanted to say that "there are five commotions or fluctuations, stirs of the mind-stuff" instead of saying that "every stir is fivefold". But he says again elsewhere<sup>11</sup> he does not dare to decide whether Patañjali's expression "*vr̥ttayaḥ pañcatayyaḥ*" is according to Pāṇini inadmissible.

H. Jacobi thus leaves an uncertain subjective way and suggests another method offering a settlement in the dispute on the identity of both authors. Its proof is to be the text itself viz. the vocabulary of both texts i. e. the Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya and the Yoga-sūtras. Each text treats of a different subject. Mahābhāṣya is a very extensive grammatical commentary whereas the Yoga-sūtras treat of yogic philosophy and practice.

H. Jacobi seems to have the following idea for his starting point: If the same author deals in his two works with two different branches of science, then his vocabulary in both of his works will be essentially the same unless it is influenced by the aims of those particular disciplines. The Yoga-sūtras as well as the Mahābhāṣya differ in their extent. The Yoga-śāstra contains only 193 sūtras, very concise whereas the Mahābhāṣya text is several hundred times more extensive and therefore offers a guarantee, that according to Jacobi almost the whole Patañjali's vocabulary was made use of there.

The statistical comparison of words in both Patañjali's texts is taken by Jacobi for a very comfortable method. The only thing one has to do is to add up those words of the Yoga-sūtra index that are missing in the Mahābhāṣya.

After comparing the vocabularies of both texts contained in the indices,<sup>12</sup> he comes to a conclusion that the Yoga-sūtras contain 557 different words almost the half of which are missing in the Mahābhāṣya (270). Subtracting the yogic terms in the total of 66 then out of 491 words of the Yoga-sūtras 204 are missing in the Mahābhāṣya i. e. nearly 3/7 and finally he concludes:<sup>13</sup>

"These figures are decisive! The possibility that the same author in one smaller work of his could introduce almost a half of the words he had no chance to use in another work of his several hundred times larger is out of the question."

In this way he actually rejects the hypothesis of the identity of Patañjali, the grammarian and the author of the Yoga-sūtras. In H. Jacobi's opinion he managed to find a solid basis for this disputable problem of the identity of the authors.

<sup>10</sup> Deutsche Literaturzeitung 1921, 1922.

<sup>11</sup> Über das ursprüngliche Yogasystem 1929, p. 11.

<sup>12</sup> Word-Index to Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya, compiled by Pandit Shridhar-shastri Pathak and Pandit Siddheshvarshastri Chitrao. Government Oriental Series No. 1. Poona 1927, pp. 1152. (Part II. was not available.) Index of Words in the Sūtras, Appendix 7 of "The Yoga-System of Patañjali" by James Haughton Woods. Harvard Oriental Series. Volume Seventeen. Cambridge 1914, pp. 366—381.

<sup>13</sup> a. a. O. p. 88.

But first of all the boundary line of the statistical method must be found out and its justification proved. Only then we can pass judgement and draw far reaching conclusions concerning the method of finding out the author by comparing the vocabularies of the two works.

Criticizing Jacobi's method we must come to the following:

1. In Jacobi's opinion the statistical method comparing the vocabularies is decisive for finding out the author.
2. The statistical method has according to him as an objective method a really conclusive force being independent of subjective view-points.
3. He supposes that it is only the actualized vocabulary that forms the basic vocabulary of the author.
4. He thinks only a mechanical comparison of both vocabularies is decisive and sufficient.

H. Jacobi is no doubt so prepossessed in favour of the mathematical principles of the statistical method that as for him it is the figures that solve the problem in the long run.

To find out to what extent the statistical method, used to determine the author, is justified, we should have to learn and make sure comparing statistically the vocabularies of such works the authors of which we know for certain. Naturally it presupposes to supply the publication of such works with a word-index.

Examining statistically the vocabulary of a particular author we have to take into consideration more important factors than those mentioned by Jacobi. First of all mere mechanical checking on and adding up words common for both works will not do. One thing must be borne in mind: Certain work offers only an actualized vocabulary, which gives no guarantee it contains all the words of the author's active and passive knowledge. The author's vocabulary is much larger than the topical words used in one particular work. We are right in supposing Patañjali, the grammarian, has a far richer vocabulary than the *Mahābhāṣya* contains and which may have approximately 25.000 words. Such an excellent grammarian, as Patañjali undoubtedly was, must have known far more words for otherwise he could not have followed the old texts nor even the current language of that time. That of course would not have been possible, if he had not known or if we suppose with Jacobi that he did not know expression already current in the *Rig-Veda*, *Atharva-Veda*, *Mahābhārata* etc. as explained later.

Following the statistical method we have to take into consideration not only the quantitative but also the qualitative differences or in some cases, also the identity or similarity of the texts.

Comparing the two texts, *Mahābhāṣya* and the *Yoga-sūtras* we shall find out the following differences:

1. The *Mahābhāṣya* is a fluent and extensive commentary to the *sūtra* text, concise and terse, whereas the *Yoga-sūtras* are literally such a sort of concise text.



2. Considering this fact we can see the fundamental difference between the two works. That is why the Yoga-sūtras have only few verbal forms (only *asti*, *syāt*, *kṣīyate*, *jāyante*) and instead of these verbal forms, so frequent in the Mahābhāṣya, the Yoga-sūtras use participles (e. g. *vyākhyātāḥ*, *sati mūle*, *tasmin sati*, *jñata-ajñata*, *kliṣṭa-akliṣṭa*, *heya*, *jñeya*, *kṣaya*, *jaya* etc.).

3. On the other hand the Yoga-sūtras also show a marked shift towards the nominal forms, nouns and adjectives required by the conciseness, accuracy, economy and truthfulness of the sūtra text. We must not forget however that the sūtra form of the text also served as a mnemonic aid for mastering the contents.

4. The aims of the two works are essential for their vocabularies. The core of the Mahābhāṣya is in its philological explanations whereas that of the Yoga-sūtras is philosophical and magic. The difference of the vocabularies of the texts cannot be found in the quantitative difference of those 66 yogic terms mentioned by Jacobi. These words are just sufficient in number for the author to express in a comparatively brief and economical form the whole process of yoga.

I believe there was no difficulty for such an excellent grammarian to express in words as adequately as possible the whole process of yoga, for on the contrary the terse sūtra form text did ask for such a concentration of the language for the preconception to be accurately precipitated and embodied in the chosen word.

5. Besides that the Yoga-sūtra text also preserves the traditional doctrine of yoga, the beginning of which must have been in the times of hoary antiquity. May be this tradition also meant a certain limitation for the author of the Yoga-sūtras. Following and keeping the deep rooted tradition and applied mnemotechnics he could not afford to express himself quite independently not to interfere with the doctrine handed down in this way.

After all it follows from the same initial sentence in the two texts which says the author understands his work to be "*anūsāsanam*". Comparing the detailed and extensive Mahābhāṣya text with that of the Yoga-sūtras we can see the terse form and conciseness of the latter. Now a question may be put: Seeing the difference in the rendering of the texts can we deduce that the author had for his work neither an older text nor the hypothetical *Yogaśāstra* by Hiraṇyagarbha mentioned by Vācaspati (to YS I 1) or by Śāṅkara (to II, I 3) and also quoted by H. Jacobi<sup>14</sup> or accept the possibility that the author relied entirely on a doctrine traditionally handed down?

<sup>14</sup> Über das ursprüngliche Yogasystem, pp. 22 (600). Sitzungsberichte der Preuß. Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse, Berlin 1929, XXVI. E. Frauwallner in Geschichte der indischen Philosophie I, Salzburg 1953, p. 439 is right to emphasize that different parts of the Yoga-sūtras have had a long history and to tell the original form of the text is now extremely difficult. Those parts of the text that have not changed nor have undergone any further alterations are of tremendous importance, that is why the author of the Yoga-sūtras also could use them without any further change. H. Jacobi

If we compare under these conditions the two texts composed by Pa-tañjali as far as their actualized or topical vocabularies are concerned using the statistical method, we have to consider both their quantitative and their qualitative aspects.

After adding up all the Yoga-sūtra words contained in Woods' word-index, we get the total number of 567 words (including such as *prabhu*, *mejayatva* which Woods does not mention in particular). There are 307 words that are the same and 260 quite different in the total number of the words appearing in the texts (Yoga-sūtras and Mahābhāṣya). Their number is therefore much lower than that given by Jacobi.

The whole comparison however is not yet completed for us to draw a conclusion that these figures and their proportion are decisive. The statistical methods is after all only an aid to find out the vocabulary.

Now we must pay a little more attention to those 260 words in the Yoga-sūtras that cannot be found in the Mahābhāṣya :

1. First of all the negative words in the Yoga-sūtras, the positive meaning of which can be found in the Mahābhāṣya belong to the common vocabulary of the two texts. Those words are as follows (their number is 21) :

Y o g a - s ū t r a s	M a h ā b h ā ṣ y a	Y o g a s ū t r a s	M a h ā b h ā ṣ y a
<i>anaṣṭa</i>	<i>naṣṭa</i>	<i>asaṃprayoga</i>	<i>saṃprayoga</i>
<i>anuttama</i>	<i>uttama</i>	<i>anātman</i>	<i>ātman</i>
<i>avidyā</i>	<i>vidyā</i>	<i>aparigraha</i>	<i>parigraha</i>
<i>aśuci</i>	<i>śuci</i>	<i>akrama</i>	<i>krama</i>
<i>asaṃkīrṇa</i>	<i>saṃkīrṇa</i>	<i>akliṣṭa</i>	<i>kliṣṭa</i>
<i>akṛṣṇa</i>	<i>kṛṣṇa</i>	<i>atat</i>	<i>tat</i>
<i>akusīda</i>	<i>kusīda</i>	<i>ajñāna</i>	<i>jñāna</i>
<i>apunya</i>	<i>punya</i>	<i>aparānta</i>	<i>parānta</i>
<i>aprayojaka</i>	<i>prayojaka</i>		

We shall add to them also :

<i>niratiśaya</i>	<i>atiśaya</i>	<i>pratipakṣa</i>	<i>pakṣa</i>
<i>pratiprasava</i>	<i>prasava</i>	<i>nirgrāhya</i>	<i>grāhya</i> .

2. Also those words derived from a different form or another word form belong to the common vocabulary. This is required by the shifting towards the nominal forms, the nouns, adjectives and participles of the sūtra text.

There are 143 words that can have the same context with topical expressions of the Mahābhāṣya. In the following list the Yoga-sūtra words go first and the Mahābhāṣya expressions follow.

---

made an attempt in this treatise to reconstruct the original Yoga text comparing it with the Sāṃkhya philosophy. E. Frauwallner (p. 476) takes this attempt of Jacobi's for being a failure though this cannot be fully justified. For this reason Frauwallner describes the yogic system himself in the exactly the same way as it was put down by Vyāsa, the first commentator of the Yoga-sūtras.



*añjanata* — *añj-*, *añjana*; *aññāta*, *jñāta* — *jñā-*, *jñātum*, *jñāna*, *jñāti*, *jñeya*; *anavasthitatva* — *anavasthita*; *anubhūta* — *anubhavya*, *bhūta*; *antardhānam* — *antardhā*; *aparināmitva*, *parināma* — *parināmaka*; *apekṣitva* — *apekṣa*, *apekṣya*; *avyapadeśya* — *avyapadeśa*; *asaṅga*, *saṅga*, *prasaṅga*, *apratisaṅga* — *prasaṅga*, *utsaṅga*; *ākṣepin* — *akṣipta*; *abhiniveśa* — *abhiniviṣṭa*; *aśuddhi*, *śuddhi*, *pariśuddhi* — *śuddha*, *śudh-*; *apratisaṃkrama* — *saṃkrama*; *abhivvyakti* — *abhivvyakta*; *asaṃkheya* — *asaṃkhyā*, *asaṃkhyatva*, *asaṃkhyatā*, *saṃkhyāna*; *utkrānti* — *utkrānta*, *utkrāntā*; *kathamtā* — *katham*; *kāritva* — *kāritā*, *kṛ-*; *kṣetrika* — *kṣetra*, *kṣetratva*, *kṣetriyaḥ*; *kaivalya* — *kevala*; *kleśa*, *kliṣṭa* — *kliṣṭa*, *akliṣṭa*; *cetanā* — *cetanāvat*; *ja-pa-jap-*; *jyotiṣmant* — *jyotiṣ*, *jyotiṣa*; *jñātrtva* — see *jñā-*; *durmanasya* — *durmanas*; *dveṣa* — *dviś*, *dviṣṭa*, *dveṣya*; *drk*, *drśya*, *draṣṭṛ*, *drśyatva*, *paridrṣṭa* — *drś-*, *drśi*, *drṣṭa*, *drṣṭavya*, *drśyamāna*; *dhāraṇā* — *dhāraṇi*, *dhāraṇa*, *nirdhāraṇā*; *dhyāna* — *dhyānavat*; *dharmīn* — *dharma*; *pañcātaya* — *pañca*, *tayap*; *paryavasāna* — *pari*, *avasāna*; *pūrvaka* — *pūrva*; *prasupta* — *supta*; *prāsānta* — *sānta*, *prāsāntṛ*; *prakāśa* — *prakāśana*; *prāśvāsa* — *śvāsa*; *maitrī* — *maitra*, *maitreya*; *yoga*, *yogyatā*, *yogyatva*, *yogin*, *yogāṅga* — *yoga*, *yogya*, *yogāṅga*; *rūpatva* — *rūpa*, *rūpavat*; *vikṣepa* — *vikṣipta*, *vikṣipa*, *vikṣepaka*; *viprakṛṣṭa* — *viprakarṣa*; *vyākhyāta* — *vyākhyātavya*, *vyākhyāna*; *viparyaya* — *viparīta*; *viśoka* — *śoka*; *viśayatva* — *viśaya*; *saptadhā* — *sapta*, *dvidhā*, *sambodha* — *sambodhana*; *sādhāraṇatva* — *sādhāraṇa*; *saṃhananātva* — *saṃhanana*; *saṃgrhītātva* — *saṃgrhīta*, *saṃgrhītavya*, *saṃgrhītr*; *sthiti* — *sthita*, *sthitvā*; *sthairya* — *sthirā*; *hetutva* — *hetu*, *hetutā*, *hetutaḥ*, *hetumat*; *hāna*, *heya* — *hīna*, *hāni* etc.

We cannot afford to suppose that such an outstanding grammarian knew only a topical expression from the Mahābhāṣya and was unable to form negations such as *avidyā* or to form an expression like *anubhūta* etc.

Even H. Jacobi himself believes many Yoga sūtra words such as *kleśa*, *vṛtti*, *citta*, *nirodha*, *asmitā*, *rāga*, *dveṣa*, *abhiniveśa* to be old genuine yogic expressions.<sup>15</sup>

The following words: *ātman*, *puruṣa*, *citi*, *citta*, *karāṇa*, *indriya*, *prāṇa*, *saṃsāra*, *bandha*, *bhoga*, *jñāna*, *vidyā*, *a vidyā*, *pramāṇa*, *pratyakṣa*, *yoga*, *īśvara*, *kāraṇa*, *nimitta*, *viśaya*, *bhūta* are taken by R. Garbe<sup>16</sup> for being prebuddhist terms. According to him *prakṛti*, *pradhāna*, *guṇa*, *sattva*, *buddhi*, *manas*, *tanmātra*, *liṅga*, *saṃskāra*, *vāsanā* etc. are words of every day life of those days. Of course R. Garbe considers words from the standpoint of Sāṃkhya philosophy and we should have to complete his list also bearing in mind the Yoga viewpoint.

3. But there is a further support however in the Petersburg Sanskrit Dictionary where we can find other words occurring in older literature. We can suppose that they were known even to Patañjali, the grammarian, though they are not mentioned in the Mahābhāṣya but only in the Yoga-sūtras.

<sup>15</sup> Über das ursprüngliche Yogasystem, pp. 9, 11, 19 etc.

<sup>16</sup> Die Sāṃkhya Philosophie, II. Auflage, Leipzig 1917, pp. 229—231.



The Rig-veda and Atharva-veda contain the following words: *adhyāsa*, *ariṣṭa*, *abhibhava*, *āpatti*, *ābhāsa*, *āloka*, *udaya*, *kṣudh*, *panthan*, *moha*, *vajra*, *vyūha*, *vipāka*, *samāpatti*.

In the Mahābhārata, the Upaniṣads, the Brāhmaṇas, the Bhagavadgītā we can find these words: *anu*, *animan*, *āvaraṇa*, *āśaya* (*anāśaya*), *udāna*, *upekṣā*, *ekāgratā*, *ekāgrya*, *kāya*, *kūrma*, *tāpa* (*paritāpa*), *tāra*, *nimna*, *nirrodha*, *nirupakrama*, *nirmāṇa*, *pañka*, *pipāsa*, *pracāra*, *prasaṅga*, *prasāda*, *prātibhā*, *bīja* (*sa-*, *nir-*), *mala*, *lobha*, *vaśīkāra*, *vastu*, *vicāra* (*sa-*, *nir-*), *vitarka* (*sa-*, *nir-*), *viccheda*, *vitṛṣṇa*, *vidhāraṇa*, *viniyoga*, *viśoka*, *vaitṛṣṇya*, *vairāgya*, *vaiśāradya*, *śūnya*, *śravaṇa*, *saṃvid*, *saṃvega*, *saṅga*, *smaya*, *smṛti*.

Some expressions can be found in the epic, dramatic literature and in dictionaries some even of a later date (Hitopadeśa, Mṛcchakatikā, Kathasaritsāgara, Śākuntalā, Amarakośa, Nirukta etc.): *antarāya*, *apavarga*, *āpūra*, *āsvāda*, *upanimantrana*, *karuṇā* (*buddh.*), *bhrānti*, *lāvaṇya*, *varaṇa*, *viveka* (*vivekin*). *Viccheda* is derived from the root *chid-* and the others are: *viccheda* in Śat. Brāhm., *chidra* in Pūr., *anavachinna*, *anavaccheda*.

4. 18 remaining expressions which can be understood to be yoga terms or are derived from the following well known words such as *adhiṣṭhātṛtvam* (*adhi+sthā*), *atīta* (*ati+i*), *anuśayin* (*Bhag. Pur.*), *anuṣṭhāna* (*anu+sthā*), *anyatā*, *aparāmrṣṭa* (in the Mahābhāṣya is *mṛṣṭa*, *mṛṣṭavat*), *avirati*, *ānantya* (*antya*), *ānuśravika*, *āsanna*, *āsevita*, *javitva*, *nairantarya*, *prachardana*, *vārttā*, *vīta*, *śaithilya*, *saṃādhi*.

At the same time we can find help only in the Petersburg sanskrit dictionaries published so far, which do not contain by far all the words used in the old literature, for many words were found there after the dictionaries had been published. Apart from that it is even impossible to find out the then frequently used words or those handed down by word of mouth or colloquial terms.

Supposing Patañjali, the grammarian, expressed his whole vocabulary only in the Mahābhāṣya we must be led to believe he could not understand certain ancient sanskrit texts. This would be the consequence of Jacobi's<sup>17</sup> superficial comparison.

The analysis of Jacobi's method reveals a fact that the statistical comparison of the two Patañjali text vocabularies leads to no conclusion. To put it differently statistical figures cannot be decisive. Jacobi's conviction about the existence of two different authors can only show that even the statistical

<sup>17</sup> H. Jacobi of course mentioned elsewhere (Deutsche Literaturzeitung 1921, 1923: Die Bhagavadgītā, Weiteres zum Bhagavadgītā Problem) that Patañjali, the grammarian, could not have used an incorrectly selected expression *pañcatayyaḥ* and argued that for that reason he could not have been the author of the Yoga-sūtras. Later he hesitated to decide the question whether the selected form *pañcatayyaḥ* instead of *vṛttiḥ pañcatayyī* is acceptable according to Pāṇini (II 2, 42). An analogical document taken from Śāṅkara to II 2, 18 and Abhidharmakośa II 13, 22 is according to Jacobi useless for the explanation of the YS. Jacobi says that every *vṛtti* naturally is not composed of five *vṛttis*. Even this presentation of Patañjali of course must become a subject of careful study if a reliable and appropriate explanation is to be given.

method however objective it may seem to be will remain purely subjective after all.<sup>18</sup>

### Y o g a - S ū t r a T e x t

The statistical comparison of the two Patañjali texts offers us a chance to judge of the Yoga-sūtra text to find out if it is quite uniform from the statistical point of view or composed of several texts belonging to different epochs and different yogic schools.

Besides that J. W. Hauer<sup>19</sup> refers to the differences in the vocabularies of these partial texts trying to help his theory of the different texts the Yoga-sūtras are said to form. In his opinion the vocabulary of the *kriyā-yoga* text (II 1—27) shows marked differences from the other texts. It contains special terms hard to explain (II 7—11, 21, 23). Hauer concludes this *kriyā-yoga* text belongs to quite a different yogic school having also its own peculiar terminology. For example the term *kleśa* taken by Jacobi for being an old genuine yoga term<sup>20</sup> does not occur in the *yogāṅga* text (II 28—III 55). This text written by Patañjali, the grammarian himself according to Hauer, is a classical yogic text, a model for other texts.

P. Deussen<sup>21</sup> says the Yoga-sūtras are composed of 4 or 5 independent texts, in J. W. Hauer's opinion of 5, each belonging to a particular school of yoga having its independent terminology.

Erich Frauwallner<sup>22</sup> separates the text of the First Book from the classical yoga of the Second and the Third (*“Unterdrückungs-Yoga”* and *“der achtgliedrige Yoga”*). According to him the Yoga-sūtras are composed of several contradictory texts. Some of them keep the original form of the doctrines.

Some of the sanskrit scholars mentioned above think, that different texts belonging to the different times deal with the selfsame subject and contents of yoga in longer or shorter variations. P. Deussen<sup>23</sup> takes the *kriyā-yoga* text (II 1—27) for the most important and I 17—51 text treating of *samādhi*

<sup>18</sup> An essential contribution to the solution of the problem of the identity of the Yoga-sūtras and of the Mahābhāṣya authors was offered by L. Renou in his treatise “On the Identity of the two Patañjalis”. The Indian Historical Quarterly, Vol. XVI. Calcutta 1940, pp. 586—591. In this work L. Renou pays attention to the quality of the simple as well as compound words in both texts and comes to the following conclusion: “The vocabulary of the Yoga-sūtras is radically distinct from that of the Mahābhāṣya. The divergences do not constitute a simple opposition between the propriety of the sūtra style and that of the bhāṣya style, still less (as it has been supposed) a mere difference which might exist between a younger Patañjali and the older Patañjali. We have to do with two different authors...” Renou's treatise shows the way to a more detailed study of the problem from the linguist's point of view. Renou of course does not take into consideration Jacobi's treatise, where Jacobi takes the statistical comparison of the vocabulary for being a decisive factor nor does he quote his treatise. Neither the Renou's treatise can be taken for the final solution of the problem of the two authors' identity.

<sup>19</sup> Der Yoga als Heilweg, Stuttgart 1932, pp. 95, 98, 99.

<sup>20</sup> Über das ursprüngliche Yoga system I, pp. 11, 19, 20.

<sup>21</sup> Allgemeine Geschichte der Philosophie I, 3. Die Nachvedische Philosophie der Inder. 4. Auflage. Leipzig 1922, p. 509.

<sup>22</sup> Geschichte der indischen Philosophie, I. Band. Salzburg 1953, pp. 427, 437, 439.

<sup>23</sup> I, 3, p. 509.



for an older one than *yogāṅga* text (II 28—III 55). J. W. Hauer<sup>24</sup> on the other hand believes that the author could save himself the trouble of talking on *tapas*, *svādhyāya*, *īśvarapraṇidhāna* in the *kriyā-yoga* text, for they are already embodied in the *yogāṅga* text (which he thinks to be the oldest).

S. Dasgupta<sup>25</sup> says, that "the sūtras, 30—34, of the last chapter seem to repeat what has already been said in the second chapter and some of the topics introduced are such that they could well have been dealt with in a more relevant manner in connection with similar discussions in the preceding chapter."

To make these from the statistical point of view contradictory hypotheses clear I will use first of all the quantitative as well as qualitative method.

Following the quantitative statistical method for the examination of the Yoga-sūtra vocabulary we have to find out first the number of words in each of the books viz. words that occur only in one of them and do not occur in others and those words appearing in different books.

Book	Total number of words	Number of words that do not recur	Recurring words
I.	204	106	98
II.	217	113	104
III.	215	120	95
IV.	162	78	84
Y. S.	798	417	381

From the statistical examination of each Yoga-sūtra book it is quite clear that each Yoga-sūtra book contains a considerable number of such words that do not recur and therefore must be special technical terms. This discovery could as a matter of fact support the theory talking about different Yoga-sūtra text which their last editor tried to present as one unified whole. Before making a conclusion however we must take notice of the recurring words and how frequently they occur in each of the Yoga-sūtra books.

In recurring words the following number of terms are common expressions found in the different Yoga-sūtra books:

Book	Book
I.—II.	I.—IV.
I., III.	II., III.
I., IV.	II., IV.
I., II., III.	II., III., IV.
I., II., IV.	II., IV.
I., III., IV.	
	Total number 150

The total number of 417 words that do not recur and 150 recurring words are 567 expressions found out previously. Words that do not recur and expressions common to the different Yoga-sūtra books form ratio 417:150, to put

<sup>24</sup> a. a. O. p. 96.

<sup>25</sup> A History of Indian Philosophy I, p. 230, Cambridge 1932.

it differently nearly  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the total number of words do not recur and only about  $\frac{1}{4}$  occur more frequently. Out of the total of 567 words 417 do not recur i. e. 73,5%, recurring words are 150 i. e. 26,5%. Book I. has about 19%, Book II. 20%, III. 21%, IV. 14% (accurately 18,7%, 19,9%, 21,1%, 13,8% = 73,5%) expressions that do not recur.

And it is still more interesting to compare the number of words in the books of Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya:

Book	Number of words	Common with Mahābhāṣya	Different
I.	106	54	52
II.	113	69	44
III.	120	45	75
IV.	78	39	39
I., II.	26	19	7
I., III.	17	9	8
I., IV.	10	6	4
I., II., III.	5	4	1
I., II., VI.	10	6	4
I., III., VI.	7	6	1
I.—IV.	23	19	4
II., III.	18	8	10
II., IV.	9	5	4
II., III., IV.	13	9	4
III., IV.	12	9	3
Total	567	307	260

The greatest disproportion between the common and different words from Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya can be seen in Book III., which J. W. Hauer believes to be the work of Patañjali, the grammarian. Apart from that however in all the four books there are only a little more than a half of words that are the same as in Mahābhāṣya. According to Jacobi each Yoga-sūtra book must have been written by another author and Patañjali, the grammarian, could have never been the author of a single Yoga-sūtra book, as also some sanskrit scholars have it.

But even here these numbers are not decisive, for the quantitative statistical method comparing the vocabulary cannot solve the question of its quality. Bearing in mind the fact that out of the total 567 words of the four Yoga-sūtra books 417 do not recur we are led to believe the Yoga-sūtra author followed the principles of economy choosing appropriate expressions. Also the fact that each book contains a considerable independent vocabulary, different from the other Yoga-sūtra books proves that the contents of those four books are different. The differences in the contents led therefore to a selection of the most adequate words.

I shall refer to some words that do not recur in the Yoga-sūtra books. It is obvious that in Book I most words are those used as technical terms in philosophy of cognition, in Book II the words refer to the yogic process of



purification, the preliminary steps of practical magic, in Book III the words deal with the magically achieved mastery over the principles of cognition and over the very basis of existence, in Book IV they treat the process of breaking the link between the subject and the object. After all this fact can be seen in the names of the books given to them by the author of the Yoga-sūtras e. g. 1. *samādhipādaḥ*, 2. *sādhana-pādaḥ*, 3. *vibhūtipādaḥ*, 4. *kaivalya-pādaḥ*.

The following words that do not recur can be found only in Book I: *pramāṇa*, *anumāna*, *āgama*, *viparyaya*, *mithyājñāna*, *vikalpa*, *nidrā*, *svapna*, *kliṣṭa*, *akliṣṭa*, *abhyāsa*, *vaśīkārasamjñā*, *vitṛṣṇa*, *vicāra*, *savicāra*, *savitarka*, *nirvicāra*, *nirvitarka*, *asampramoṣa*, *antarāya*, *ālasya*, *bhrānti*, *sabīja*, *prasaḍa*, *ānanda*, *aparāmrṣṭa*, *adhyātma*, *śraddhā*, *karuṇā*, *grahītr*, *cetanā*, *vikṣepa*, *paramāṇu*.

These expressions again can be found in Book II for example: *kriyāyoga*, *avidyā*, *saṁyoga*, *abhiniveśa*, *dveṣa*, *rasa*, *anātman*, *anuśayin*, *krodha*, *moha*, *lobha*, *ahiṁsā*, *asteya*, *aparigraha*, *aparavarga*, *śuddha*, *śuci*, *upalabdhi*, *svāmin*, *pratipakṣa*, *hlāda*, *ekāgrya*, *anuṣṭhāna*, *tanu*, *prasupta*, *tyāga*, *drk*, *drśi*, *heya*.

Book III contains terms such as: *kṣaya*, *jaya*, *saṁyama*, *bala*, *saṁbandha*, *prasaṅga*, *saṅga*, *doṣa*, *prātibhā*, *anvaya*, *ekāgrata*, *sāṅkṣat*, *ākāśa*.

And in Book IV occur expressions as follows: *uparakta*, *uparāga*, *vāsanā*, *āśis*, *citi*, *buddhi*, *aparīṇāmitva*, *nirmāṇa*, *prasamkhyāna*, *oṣadhi*, *megha*, *bheda*, *mantra*, *tantra*.

The following words common to all the four Yoga-sūtra books are for example: *citta*, *vṛtti*, *saṁskāra*, *artha*, *asmitā*, *karman*, *pratyaya*, *samādhi*, *sūkṣma*, *jñāna*, *darśana*, *rūpa*, *svarūpa*. The word *kaivalya* as well as *viveka*, *siddhi*, *śakti*, *parīṇāma* can be found in Books II., III., IV. The word *nirodha* is in Books I. and III., *kleśa* in II., IV. (and *kliṣṭa*, *akliṣṭa* in Book I.).

We can judge from this that *nirodha* of Book I. is a prerequisite for Book III. and that for this reason "*Unterdrückungs-yoga = nirodha-yoga*" and "*der achtgliedrige Yoga = yogāṅga*" are interdependent. *Kaivalya* as the final objective of yoga is not mentioned in Book I. whereas the term *samādhi* can be found in all the four books. It is not possible therefore to identify these terms as P. Deussen<sup>26</sup> wrongly believes.

Only in the light of the quantitative statistical examination the second supposition about the different Yoga-sūtra texts could also be justified. Supporting this view P. Deussen, J. W. Hauer, Erich Frauwallner and others also say that each Yoga-sūtra book has its own terminology. Considering all this it is necessary to prove whether these different terms can be applied to the same yoga notions and processes as for example P. Deussen believes, whether we really have to deal with several types of yoga according to J. W. Hauer's and Erich Frauwallner's theory or accept the idea that it is only the whole text that can present the yoga process in its totality.

The examination naturally does not lie in the quantitative statistics but

<sup>26</sup> a. a. O. I, 3, p. 509.

in considering the qualitative value of both the vocabulary and the whole text or even the texts separately. In any case one cannot succeed in referring to the vocabularies in each of the books or texts as to a decisive factor, for the statistical figures treat all the possibilities in the same way. Here again mere figures cannot solve the question, they just indicate the direction and interest of the search.

Following the methodical principles the examination can go on like this:

1. The starting point of our investigation is the Yoga-sūtra text itself and the commentaries. We shall find out the corresponding points and the differences in both the text and the commentaries.

2. We shall find out the exact meaning of a certain expression occurring in all the four books (e. g. *pratyaya*, *samādhi* etc.).<sup>27</sup>

3. We shall make sure whether there could be a possibility of several yoga schools existing in the Yoga-sūtra texts. This method starts its analysis examining the later more differentiated schools and therefore is regressive.

4. We shall find out if the yoga system found in the Yoga-sūtra text is a sort of yoga without differentiation, from which further yoga schools evolved. This is a progressive method.

5. Or we shall look for contexts and points of similarity in other kindred schools (Buddhism, Jainism, Upaniṣads etc.). While doing so we must be careful not to impute disparate meanings of a given common word, idea or method of a different philosophical school to the text.

Using this opportunity I must point to a remarkable treatise written by Maryla Falk.<sup>28</sup> The author warns against the risks of those methods that try to explain religious or philosophical notions by means of etymology or comparative religious science.

Maryla Falk lays stress on the necessity of a careful analysis of all the contexts in which certain notion occurred in the course of its development in order that its significance may be made quite accurate. This requirement is still little paid attention to for most scientific treatises concentrate their interest on a comparatively limited field or in one direction only or consider just one single period. The difficulty lies in the richness of the material, the analysis of which is a question of special study.

Apart from that the comparative method has urged so far what could be called "*influence-finding*" i. e. it took an expression common to different philosophies and religions in the majority of cases for a device helping to find out traces of mutual influences between philosophies. In this way an independent development of a particular expression was obstructed and the clarity of its line dimmed.

Finally examining the oldest stages in the philosophical and religious development we must consider present day explanations of these stages e. g.

<sup>27</sup> See Archiv Orientální XX, Prague 1952. "The Methodical Principle in Patañjali's Yoga-sūtras and XXV, Prague 1957: "The Meaning of *pratyaya* in Patañjali's Yoga-sūtras," pp. 211—270.

<sup>28</sup> "Indologie auf den Wegen und Abwegen vergleichender Religionsforschung". Polish Bulletin of Oriental Studies I, Warschau 1937, pp. 18—37.



J. L. Fischer's<sup>29</sup> explanation of the panplectic principle throwing light on the theory of equivalents in magic, which especially Polish indology tried to elucidate in Indian philosophy.<sup>30</sup>

In this sort of investigation the statistical method is only an aid—not a decisive factor. Its figures cannot decide anything as H. Jacobi wrongly believed, for these figures must be scientifically examined. The statistical method is not an objective one, but mainly a quantitative one, which the qualitative method must help to complete. The qualitative method is not more subjective than any other scientific method including the statistical.

It is quite clear from the analysis, the justification and the limits of the statistical method that the problem of Patañjali's Yoga-sūtras has not been solved yet and remaining unsolved will require further scientific investigation to prove:

1. whether the text is to be understood as a unified whole or a collection of different texts,
2. whether the Yoga-sūtras and the Mahābhāṣya were written by one or two different authors.

<sup>29</sup> J. L. Fischer "La panplexie", Overdruk uit Pro regno pro sanctuario, C. F. Callenbach N. V. Uitgever, Nijkerk, pp. 199—209, 1952 and the Czech book "Three Stages" 1948.

<sup>30</sup> See: Maryla Falk: "Il mito psicologico nell' India antica". Memorie della R. Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. Classe di scienze morali. Vol. VIII. Serie 6<sup>a</sup>. Roma 1939, pp. 289—738.

St. Schayer: „Die Struktur der magischen Weltanschauung nach dem Atharva-Veda und den Brāhmaṇa Texten“. Zeitschrift für Buddhismus. München 1925, pp. 45. — Constantin Regamey: „Die Religionen Indiens“ in „Christus und die Religionen der Erde“ III. Band, Wien 1951, pp. 81 and 118.